



IVIEWIT HOLDINGS, INC.

P. Stephen Lamont
Chief Executive Officer

Direct Dial: 914-217-0038
Email: pstephen.lamont@verizon.net
Reply Address: 35 Locust Avenue
Rye, N.Y. 10580

By Electronic and Overnight Mail

January 18, 2007

Sampak Garg
House Judiciary Committee
2138 Rayburn House Office Building
Washington, DC 20515

Re: Affirmed Follow-On to the September 29, 2006 Affirmed Statement Sent From Rep. Nita M. Lowey to Chairman John D. Dingell ("Statement"), Attached as Exhibit "A."

Dear Mr. Garg:

By way of introduction, I am P. Stephen Lamont, CEO of, as well as a significant shareholder in, Iviewit Holdings, Inc. ("Iviewit"), and the constituent in question regarding Rep. Nita M. Lowey's November 28 letter to John D. Dingell, Chairman of the House Energy and Commerce Committee, attached as Exhibit "B" for your convenience. Since Jonathan Cordone, the Deputy General Counsel of Chairman Dingell's office, among others, passed part and parcel of the allegations to the Judiciary Committee ("Committee"), also attached as Exhibit "B," I am writing to give the Committee a head start by providing all prior and concurrent Federal, State, and Foreign Bodies that have received similar information contained in the Statement, most times a great deal more, including contact names and status, attached as Exhibit "C". Additionally, such bodies

are also recipients of volumes of evidence pertaining to the allegations in my Statement. Furthermore, in an attached Exhibit “D,” I include names and contact information for the main alleged perpetrators that have engaged in the alleged patterns of criminal sabotage, fraud, and theft as described in my Statement, and not only against Iviewit shareholders, but against the United States Patent and Trademark Office and the Department of Commerce themselves.

Furthermore, I trust that you will give my Statement and this follow-on information the consideration that it deserves, and should you have any further questions pertaining to the issues in my Statement and/or this follow-on, feel free to call on me.

Briefly, to summarize Exhibit C, and first under Federal Bodies, it should be clear that while Iviewit has submitted volumes of incriminating information for the past number of years, determinations are taking an inordinate amount of time to surface, and some information, upon information and belief, is also protected by privacy laws, both factors of which act as means to deny Iviewit process and jeopardizes intellectual property rights. Moreover, and in light of where CFR §1.103 - Suspension of Action by the Office, or any other applicable section or any other provision in United States Code Title 35 – Patents, contains insufficient time periods to investigate the allegation of sabotage, fraud, and theft including the exhaustion of appeals to any decision, the current minimal time periods of available patent application suspensions may lead to a loss of intellectual property rights in diametric opposition to the protections afforded inventors under Article 1, Section 8, Clause 8 of the Constitution of the United States.

Second, and under State Bodies, it should be clear that conflicts of interest and cover-up attempts instituted by the main alleged perpetrators have run rampant, and equally deny Iviewit process. Moreover, it is imperative to point out that, notwithstanding the patterns of sabotage, fraud, and theft that run so wide and so deep that it tears at the very fabric of what we call free commerce in this country, neither has there been one investigation that has come to light (even though Court ordered, see State Bodies of Exhibit “C” - Appellate Division, First Department, New York), nor one witness called, nor one non-conflicted statement called for and submitted, but only that the alleged main perpetrators have escaped justice at lawyer controlled State bodies and by a billing dispute default (see State Bodies of Exhibit “C” - 15th Judicial Circuit, Palm Beach County, Florida).

Third, under Foreign Bodies, overseas patent officials are frozen like “deers in a headlight” at the aforementioned patterns of sabotage, fraud, and theft that runs so wide and so deep that it tears at the very fabric of what we call free commerce in this country, and equally denies Iviewit process. Moreover, and what began at the USPTO with the filing of four sabotaged, core patent applications, has transcended into a cavalcade of duplicate fraudulent filings instigated and committed by the main alleged perpetrators and transmitted to and through as many as 30 foreign countries by means of the Patent Cooperation Treaty. As such, this multiplicital intercourse of sabotage, fraud, and theft has become so immense as to render foreign patent officials speechless, and from The Hague, Neth. to Tokyo, Jap.

Lastly, I submit that the LaBarga billing dispute Court, the very Court that gave us our 43rd President, was not a forum for justice, but a mockery of it, and in the fact that the Supreme Court of the United States denied a petition to overturn a Florida Supreme Court

decision raises a “catch-22” situation in where to bring charges against public officials proven violating public offices in their blueprint of creating conflicts of interest and cover-ups in an effort to cloak their **PATTERNS OF SABOTAGE, FRAUD, AND THEFT THAT RUN SO WIDE AND SO DEEP THAT IT TEARS AT THE VERY FABRIC OF WHAT WE CALL FREE COMMERCE IN THIS COUNTRY;** effectively, both have estopped Iviewit from seeking any civil relief whatsoever. Moreover, it is for all the above reasons, and especially the Affirmed Written Statement attached as Exhibit “A,” as well as the denial of any process whatsoever depicted in Exhibit “C,” that Iviewit requests an immediate investigation of the allegations contained herein.

Very truly yours,

P. Stephen Lamont

Cc: Chairman John Conyers, House Judiciary Committee
Chairman John D. Dingell, House Energy and Commerce Committee.
Rep. Nita M. Lowey, c/o Peter Feroe, District Representative (NY 18th)



CERTIFICATE OF AFFIRMATION

STATE OF NEW YORK
COUNTY OF WESTCHESTER:

Before me, the undersigned authority, personally appeared P. Stephen Lamont, who was duly sworn and says that the facts alleged in the foregoing and subsequent statements are true.

P. Stephen Lamont

Sworn to and subscribed to me on this January 18, 2007.

Notary Public



Exhibit "A"



IVIEWIT HOLDINGS, INC.

P. Stephen Lamont
Chief Executive Officer
Direct Dial: 914-217-0038

By Overnight Mail

September 29, 2006

Representative Nita M. Lowey
United States Congress
2329 Rayburn House Office Building
Washington, D.C. 20515-3218

Re: Affirmed Request for Investigation Regarding Article 1, Section 8, Clause 8 of the Constitution of the United States as a Result of Denial of Due Process in the Alleged Improprieties in the Filing of Patent Applications on behalf of Iviewit Holdings, Inc. and its Subsidiaries, Affiliates, and Related Parties and the Resulting Cover-Ups Thereto.

Dear Representative Lowey:

By way of introduction, I am P. Stephen Lamont, CEO of, as well as a significant shareholder in, Iviewit Holdings, Inc., a privately held Delaware corporation, and its subsidiaries, affiliates and related parties (collectively "Iviewit") with more than a fifteen year track record as a multimedia technology and consumer electronics licensing executive and holder of a J.D. in Intellectual Property Law, an M.B.A in Finance, and a B.S. in Industrial Engineering, and I write in disgust at the denial of due process in the pattern of frauds, deceits, and misrepresentations that run so wide and so deep that it tears at the very fabric of what has become to be know as free commerce in this country, and,

in the fact that it pertains to inventors rights, tears at the very fabric of the Constitution of the United States more fully described below.

BACKGROUND

In mid 1998, Iviewit's founder, Eliot I. Bernstein, among others ("Inventors"), came upon inventions pertaining to what industry experts have heretofore described as profound shifts from traditional techniques in video and imaging then overlooked in the annals of video and imaging technology. Factually, the technology is one of capturing a video frame at a 320 by 240 frame size (roughly, 1/4 of a display device) at a frame rate of one (1) to infinity frames per second ("fps" and at the twenty four (24) to thirty (30) range commonly referred to as "full frame rates" to those skilled in the art). Moreover, once captured, and in its simplest terms, the scaled frames are then digitized (if necessary), filtered, encoded, and delivered to an agnostic display device and zoomed to a full frame size of 1280 by 960 at the full frame rates of 24 to 30 fps. The result is, when combined with other proprietary technologies, DVD quality video at bandwidths of 700 or more Kbps to 6 Mbps per second, at a surprising seventy five percent (75%) savings in throughput ("bandwidth") on any digital delivery system such as digital terrestrial, cable, satellite, multipoint-multichannel delivery system, or the Internet, and a similar 75% savings in storage on mediums such as digital video discs ("DVD's") and the hard drives of many consumer electronic devices. Moreover, on the imaging side, the Iviewit inventions are used on almost every digital camera and present screen design and other devices that utilize the feature of "digital zoom". Furthermore, industry observers who benefited from the Iviewit disclosures have gone on to claim "you could have put 10,000 engineers in a room for 10,000 years and they would never have come up

with these ideas...”

Moreover, and while grant it I was not a participant during the alleged burying and purported theft of the technologies, I found myself leading a company in the midst of a cover up surrounding the following depictions of frauds, deceits, and misrepresentations that run so wide and so deep that it tears at the very fabric of what has become to be know as free commerce in this country, and, in the fact that it pertains to inventors rights, tears at the very fabric of the Constitution of the United States.

Initially, and early in my tenure, rumors began swirling around the company with finger pointing and all from Florida to Los Angeles wherein it caught the jet stream and arrived very soon in New York of alleged breaches of confidentiality pertaining to Iviewit technology, transfers of trade secrets, and, even in certain circumstances, the knowing and willful invention fraud by the outright switching of signature pages of patent filings by early patent counsels. Additionally, during my tenure, I was in possession of an executed patent application pertaining to Iviewit’s core imaging technology with the inventors of Bernstein and Shirajee, when, out of thin air, and just prior to filing, such patent application witnesses the addition of a one Brian G. Utley (“Utley”) as an inventor, and an individual who could not have been farther from the heat of the inventive stage of the imaging technology.

Still further, I submit that at the first disclosures of the inventions, patent counsel, who had spent half a lifetime procuring technologies for the transmission of full screen, full frame rate video across a variety of transmission networks, and who during the Iviewit

disclosures have been known to state “[I] missed that,” and “[I] never thought of that,” and “[This] changes everything,” or words to those effects, were so fearful that Iviewit would partner with other proprietary technologies across the video value chain and wipe the carefully crafted patent pools off the face of the map, therefore, the Iviewit inventions HAD to be buried to preserve those pools.

That was the first step, with the second step, through the direct and indirect introductions of Iviewit, with executed confidentiality agreements (“NDA’s”), to some five hundred potential licensees by colleagues of patent counsel, being the proliferation of Iviewit disclosures across a wide array of potential licensees and competitors.

Following along, we arrive at the point in the past when the Iviewit inventions had been buried and that everyone had begun to use it, when past management in Iviewit and new patent counsel may have thought “Hey, okay, great, but now what’s in it for us,” that proceeded to a final step, and in addition to the intentional change of inventors with the inclusion of Utley, the corporate shell game that involved multiple, unauthorized, similarly named corporate formations and unauthorized stock swaps and unauthorized asset transfers that resulted in the core patent applications assigned to an entity that may have only one shareholder, the limited liability partnership of Proskauer Rose, the alleged perpetrating patent counsel, perhaps, with a view towards resurrecting the backbone technologies at some future point.

Moreover, in the above series of allegations, Iviewit is confident that your Office will find a reasonable certainty that Messrs. Kenneth Rubenstein (“Rubenstein”), Raymond A. Joao (“Joao”), William J. Dick (“Dick”), Steven Becker, and Douglas Boehm, all present

or former members of the distinguished Bar of the United States Patent and Trademark Office (“USPTO”), designed and executed, either for themselves or others similarly situated, the deceptions, improprieties, and, even in certain circumstances, outright misappropriation by the disingenuous redirection of the disclosed Iviewit techniques by: (i) burying the critical elements of the inventions in patent applications; (ii) allowing the unauthorized use of Iviewit’s inventions under NDA’s without enforcement of said NDA’s; (III) filing patent applications of their own or others based on the Iviewit inventions; (IV) submitting knowingly false statements and falsified documents done with intent to commit fraud on the USPTO, Iviewit’s shareholders, and the Iviewit inventors.

Furthermore, as a result of the series of allegations enclosed, and although it is clear to Iviewit that the role of Congress is to *make* law not to *enforce* law, Iviewit finds it reasonable that your Office: (i) shall find the requisite merit to initiate Congressional investigations; (ii) shall pass these allegations to a Congressional staff attorney in the House Committee on Energy and Commerce, or other appropriate committee, for further investigation; (iii) shall instruct said staff attorney to institute a formal Congressional investigation, including questioning, requests for records, and other information from all parties involved; (iv) shall refer said attorney’s findings back to you as a Representative in the Congress of the United States; (v) shall present such findings to the House Committee on Energy and Commerce, or other appropriate committee, for determinative review; and finally (vi) shall witness said Congressional committee to urge disciplinary

action against the alleged offending attorneys by the U.S. Attorney's Office or other organization, agency, or court of appropriate jurisdiction.

Lastly, Iviewit often asks itself, among other things, "Why did the Hon. Jorge LaBarga of the Circuit Court of the Fifteenth Judicial District, Florida deny Iviewit's Motion for Leave to Amend Answer to Assert Counterclaim for Damages (concerning the aforementioned allegations)" and "Why did The Florida Bar ('TFB') dismiss the complaint against Christopher C. Wheeler, Esq. ('Wheeler' and, a non-patent attorney, a main protagonist of the above referenced allegations) despite overwhelming evidence to the contrary" and "Why did the Supreme Court of Florida deny Iviewit's Petition to begin the immediate investigation of the Wheeler complaint (when TFB admitted in writing that the answer to the Wheeler complaint was authored by an attorney in flagrant violation of his public office obligations)" and "Why did the First Department Departmental Disciplinary Committee of New York stall Iviewit's complaint against Rubenstein and Joao despite overwhelming evidence to the contrary" and "Why, despite the New York State Supreme Court Appellate Division First Department's order to begin the immediate investigation of Rubenstein and Joao, did the Second Department Departmental Disciplinary Committee of New York dismiss the Rubenstein and Joao complaints and stating that they were 'not under the jurisdiction' of the First Department Court" and "Why did the Virginia Bar Association dismiss the Dick complaint despite overwhelming evidence to the contrary" and "Why did the Supreme Court of the United States decline to hear Iviewit's *Petition for Writ of Certiorari to the Florida Supreme Court* to overturn the Florida Court's decision" and "why did John Doll, Commissioner

of Patents at the USPTO, fail to correct the inventors, and refuses to take or return Iviewit's call, in a petition filed more than three years ago" and Iviewit finds itself answering "[T]HAT IT IS ALL PART AND PARCEL OF THE TOTAL DENIAL OF DUE PROCESS IN THE PATTERN OF FRAUDS, DECEITS, AND MISREPRESENTATIONS THAT RUN SO WIDE AND SO DEEP THAT IT TEARS AT THE VERY FABRIC OF WHAT HAS BECOME TO BE KNOW AS FREE COMMERCE IN THIS COUNTRY, AND, IN THE FACT THAT IT PERTAINS TO INVENTORS RIGHTS, TEARS AT THE VERY FABRIC OF THE CONSTITUTION OF THE UNITED STATES."

Very truly yours,

IVIEWIT HOLDINGS, INC.

By: _____
Chief Executive Officer

Please copy replies to:

P. Stephen Lamont
35 Locust Avenue
Rye, N.Y. 10580
(914) 217-0038



CERTIFICATE OF AFFIRMATION

STATE OF NEW YORK
COUNTY OF WESTCHESTER:

Before me, the undersigned authority, personally appeared P. Stephen Lamont, who was duly sworn and says that the facts alleged in the foregoing statement are true.

P. Stephen Lamont

Sworn to and subscribed to me on this 15th day of September 2006.

Notary Public



Exhibit "B"

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

SUBCOMMITTEE
LABOR, HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES
AND EDUCATIONFOREIGN OPERATIONS,
EXPORT FINANCING AND
RELATED PROGRAMS

DISTRICT OFFICES

WESTCHESTER
222 WAMARONECK AVENUE
SUITE 310
WHITE PLAINS, NY 10605
(914) 426-1707
FAX: (914) 758-1506GRINTON / WILL LIBRARY
1600 CENTRAL PARK AVENUE
YONKERS, NY 10710
(914) 778-0768
(By Appointment)

WASHINGTON OFFICE:

2227 RAYBURN HOUSE OFFICE BUILDING
WASHINGTON, DC 20515
(202) 225-4806
FAX: (202) 225-0548**Nita M. Lowey**
Congress of the United States
18th District, New YorkROCKLAND
18 THIRD STREET
NEW CITY, NY 10954
(845) 638-3400
FAX: (845) 638-3487


November 28, 2006

Mr. P. Stephen Lamont
35 Locust Avenue
Rye, New York 10580

Dear Mr. Lamont:

I received your letter requesting that the Energy and Commerce Committee investigate the allegations you have made regarding the theft of patents from Iviewit Technologies, Inc. Since I do not sit on the Energy and Commerce Committee, I forwarded your letter to the incoming Chairman of the House Energy and Commerce Committee, Mr. John Dingell. Enclosed is a copy of that letter for your records. I trust that Mr. Dingell will give this matter the consideration that it deserves.

Sincerely,


Nita M. Lowey
Member of Congress

NML:pf

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

SUBCOMMITTEES:

LABOR, HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES,
AND EDUCATION

FOREIGN OPERATIONS,
EXPORT FINANCING AND
RELATED PROGRAMS



Nita M. Lowey
Congress of the United States
1Sth District, New York

WASHINGTON OFFICE:

2329 RAYBURN HOUSE OFFICE BUILDING
WASHINGTON, DC 20515
(202) 225-6500
FAX: (202) 225-0544

DISTRICT OFFICE:

WESTCHSTER

722 MAMARONECK AVENUE
SUITE 310
WHITE PLAINS, NY 10615
(914) 426-1707
FAX: (914) 328-1505

GRINTON I WILL LIBRARY
1500 CENTRAL PARK AVENUE
YONKERS, NY 10710
(914) 772-8700
(By Appointment)

ROCKLAND

15 THIRD STREET
NEW CITY, NY 10800
(914) 638-2400
FAX: (914) 638-2467

November 28, 2006


Hon. John D. Dingell
Incoming Chairman
Energy and Commerce Committee
2322 Rayburn House Office Building
U S House Of Representatives
Washington, D.C. 20515

Dear Mr. Chairman:

I am writing at the request of my constituent, Mr. P. Stephen Lamont, CEO of Iviewit Technologies, Inc. Mr. Lamont wrote to me requesting that the Energy and Commerce Committee investigate the alleged theft of several patents belonging to Iviewit and its founders. Enclosed is a copy of the letter sent to me by Mr. Lamont.

I trust that you will give this matter the consideration it deserves.

Sincerely,


Nita M. Lowey
Member of Congress

NML:pf

P. Stephen Lamont

From: Vogel, David [David.Vogel@mail.house.gov]
Sent: Wednesday, January 10, 2007 1:58 PM
To: 'pstephen.lamont@verizon.net'; 'Sam.Garg@mail.house.gov'
Cc: Caroline P. Rogers Esq.; Andrew Dietz; Eliot I. Bernstein; Feroe, Peter
Subject: RE: Affirmed Written Statement to Representative Lowey

Mr. Lamont,

Thank you for sending your Affirmed Written Statement as well as Ms. Lowey's correspondence with Chairman Dingell. After consulting with Mr. Cordone as well as others I am forwarding you along to Sam Garg of the Judiciary Committee.

Thank you,
David Vogel

-----Original Message-----

From: P. Stephen Lamont [<mailto:pstephen.lamont@verizon.net>]
Sent: Monday, January 08, 2007 2:24 PM
To: Vogel, David
Cc: Caroline P. Rogers Esq.; Andrew Dietz; Elliot I. Bernstein; Feroe, Peter
Subject: Affirmed Written Statement to Representative Lowey
Importance: High

Mr. Vogel,

Thank you for your time on the phone earlier, and attached is my original Affirmed Written Statement to Rep. Lowey and her cover letter to Chairman Dingell concerning same.

Moreover, to summarize our discussion, you will be discussing the Affirmed Written Statement with your committee's Assistant General Counsel, Jonathan Cordone, to determine whether your House committee has jurisdiction, and you offered to apprise me either way.

Furthermore, should your House Committee not have jurisdiction, you offered to forward my Affirmed Written Statement to the appropriate committee and copy me on your transmission.

Finally, should you or Mr. Cordone have any further questions, feel free to contact me.

<< File: 2006 11 28 Nita Lowey to John Dingell letter.pdf >> << File: Representative Nita M. Lowey_Affirmed Written Statement.pdf >>

**Best regards,
P. Stephen Lamont
Chief Executive Officer
Iviewit Technologies, Inc.
39 Little Avenue
Red Bluff, Cal. 96080**

Tel: 914-217-0038

Email: psl@iviewit.tv; pstephen.lamont@verizon.net; pstephenlamont@mycingular.blackberry.net

URL: www.iviewit.tv

THIS MESSAGE AND ITS EMBEDDED AND/OR ATTACHED FILES INCORPORATED HEREIN BY REFERENCE CONTAIN INFORMATION THAT IS PROPRIETARY AND CONFIDENTIAL, PRIVILEGED INFORMATION. IF YOU ARE NOT THE INTENDED RECIPIENT, YOU ARE PROHIBITED FROM READING, OPENING, PRINTING, COPYING, FORWARDING, OR SAVING THIS MAIL AND ITS EMBEDDED AND/OR ATTACHED FILES. PLEASE DELETE THE MESSAGE AND ITS EMBEDDED AND/OR ATTACHED FILES WITHOUT READING, OPENING, PRINTING, COPYING, FORWARDING, OR SAVING THEM, AND NOTIFY THE SENDER IMMEDIATELY AT 530.526.5750. IF YOU ARE THE INTENDED RECIPIENT, YOU ARE PROHIBITED FROM FORWARDING THEM OR OTHERWISE DISCLOSING THESE CONTENTS TO OTHERS, WITHOUT THE EXPRESS WRITTEN CONSENT OF THE SENDER.



Exhibit "C"

Iviewit Denial of Due Process Chart

#	Department Filed With	Complaint	Filed With	Determination	NOTES
1	House, Judiciary Committee	John Dingell, House Energy & Commerce Committee forwards Iviewit former CEO, P. Stephen Lamont complaint to Nita Lowey to Judiciary Committee, Sam Garg	House Judiciary Committee by The Honorable John Dingell	Introduced January 2007	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • P. Stephen Lamont, former Iviewit CEO, files complaint with Nita Lowey regarding his personal interests in the Iviewit companies and informs her of crimes against the United States Patent & Trademark Office, other United States agencies and international crimes against foreign nations. • Lowey passes the information to John Dingell, House Energy and Commerce Committee • Dingell forwards complaint to Sam Garg, House Judiciary Committee • Inventor Eliot I. Bernstein petitions Hon. Senator Dianne Feinstein of the Senate Judiciary Committee on behalf of inventor protections under Article 1, Sec. 8, Clause 8
2	The Honorable Senator Dianne Feinstein	Appeal for Congress to intervene on behalf of inventor Bernstein under (i) Article 1, Section 8, Clause 8 inventor protections (ii) Due Process & Procedure (iii) Civil Right to Life and (iv) notify Congress of crimes directly against the United States	The Honorable Senator Dianne Feinstein	2006	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Waiting for response from office concerning the best places to take the complaint filed within Congress. • Petition to Feinstein asks for Government oversight as criminals have violated public offices of a multiplicity of government agencies in attempts to defraud inventors' of inventions. • Call for government to be accountable for all investigations that have been found fraught with conflicts. • Call for Congress to enact legislation that suspends patents indefinitely while investigations are ongoing to protect patents from loss in opposite of the Constitution. • Call for Congress to enact protections for inventors and others lives, after car bombing. • Alert of potential Patentgate •
3	Federal Bureau of Investigation	Written Statement with evidence and witnesses. Personal interviews with Eliot I. Bernstein & P. Stephen Lamont	Special Agent ~ Stephen Luchessi - West Palm Beach by Iviewit Management and Shareholders	Formal Investigation - Ongoing Since 2000	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2005 Luchessi confirms contact with Moatz to formally investigate federal crimes against the USPTO and Commerce Department. • 2005 Luchessi states he has taken complaints to US Attorney for Southern District of Florida for formal investigations. • 2000 FBI initially notified in the Long Beach, California offices, that death threats had been made against inventor Bernstein and that Harry Moatz of the patent office had been apprised of possible fraud against the USPTO. Formal complaints of the death threats was filed with the Rancho Palos Verdes local offices.
4	FBI/Boynton Beach Fire Dept & The Florida Fire Marshall	Car Bomb planted in inventor Eliot I. Bernstein's family mini-van	FBI, Special Agent ~ Stephen Luchessi & Boynton Beach Fire Investigator Rick Lee/The Florida Fire Marshall	Formal Investigation - Ongoing Since 2005 - Images @ www.iviewit.tv	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Status of investigation unknown. • No protections instituted for inventor Bernstein or his family, despite the attempt and threats on their lives. • Bernstein's forced to flee again for their lives from Florida, the first time after Brian G. Utlely threatened the life on inventor Bernstein in 2000 if he exposed the crimes initially exposed by Arthur Andersen and others
5	U.S. Attorney, Southern District Florida	Case brought by FBI, Special Agent, Luchessi		Formal Investigation - Ongoing since 2004	Unknown status of investigation

Iviewit Denial of Due Process Chart

<i>Department Filed With</i>	<i>Complaint</i>	<i>Filed With</i>	<i>Determination</i>	<i>NOTES</i>
6 United States Patent & Trademark Office	Petition for Change of Inventors based on charges of fraud on the United States	Commissioner of Patents on advisement of Harry I. Moatz by Inventors & Investor Crossbow Ventures / Small Business Administration	Formal Investigation - Ongoing Since 1999	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Investigation has led to suspensions of patent applications by the Commissioner pending investigation outcome • Petition for continued suspension by inventors is granted by the Commissioners' office pending investigation into the alleged patent crimes • Investigation may cause loss of inventor rights as current law is not in place for issues where patent bar members have committed fraud against states and investigations take longer than current suspension laws allow for; Congress is petitioned via Dianne Feinstein, by inventor Eliot I. Bernstein for changes to legislation to protect inventor rights. • Moatz advises inventors to call upon Congress to intercede where inventors, owners and assignees on intellectual properties have been falsified, to pursue having the intellectual properties corrected and returned to the true and proper inventors • The inventors are unable to make changes or gain information where they are not listed on the patents under current law • Commissioner of Patents apprised of OED formal investigations with FBI • At the direction of Moatz, Stephen Warner of Crossbow Ventures, (two-thirds federal Small Business Administration funds) sig
7 United States Patent & Trademark Office - Office of Enrollment & Discipline	Formal complaints filed with evidence and witnesses provided. Formal investigation of allegations of fraud on the USPTO by registered members of the federal Patent Bar	Director, Harry I. Moatz by Eliot I. Bernstein & P. Stephen Lamont	Formal Investigation - Ongoing Since 1999	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Formal investigation of law firms and patent attorneys <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Proskauer Rose (Kenneth Rubenstein, Raymond Joao, others) o Foley & Lardner (William J. Dick, Steven Becker & Douglas Bohem) o Blakely, Sokoloff, Taylor & Zafman (Norman Zafman, Thomas Coester, others) o Meltzer Lippe Goldstein Wolfe & Schlissel (Raymond Joao, others) o Schiffrin & Barroway (Andrew Barroway, Krishna Narine, others) • Per Moatz, he has begun formal investigation with Special Agent Stephen Luchessi of the FBI concerning the federal crimes committed against the USPTO and United States by the aforementioned law firms and lawyers • Moatz designs patent office team to get inventions suspended at USPTO and directs inventors to file fraud upon the USPTO • Moatz advises inventors to seek congressional intervention regarding a variety of patent issues • Patents are found in former management Brian Utley's name, the patents ending up in fraudulent companies • Patents, 90 patents, are found in former patent counsel Raymond Joao's name, many of them being written while he was retained counsel for Iviewit and taken from Iviewit
8 United States Supreme Court	Case No. 05-6611 Eliot I. Bernstein v. The Florida Bar - Certiorari of Florida Supreme Court Case SC-1078	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Justices o ? o ? o ? o ? o ? o ? 	Denied. Although United States Solicitor General was invited to undertake the crimes alleged against the United States, no response to court or Bernstein was ever tendered in response prior to the Supreme Court denying hearing the case.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Court denied hearing of case, precluding Iviewit shareholders from advancing claims against attorney's caught violating Supreme Court of Florida public offices. • Denying the case set a "Catch 22" whereby citizens were precluded rights to have formal docketing of complaints against public officials and with no state or federal forum to file. •

Ivewit Denial of Due Process Chart

<i>Department Filed With</i>	<i>Complaint</i>	<i>Filed With</i>	<i>Determination</i>	<i>NOTES</i>
9 United States Bankruptcy Court Southern District of Florida	Case No. 01-33407-BKC-SHF- Intel (RYJO), Brian Utley, Raymond Hersh and Michael Reale file involuntary bankruptcy against Ivewit.com LLC		Case dropped upon Ivewit retaining counsel to replace counsel that was prior unknown, acting on the companies behalf. Case will be appealed based upon startling new evidence, once due process can be assured in a conflict free forum.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ivewit was notified by investors in 2001 while doing a Private Placement with Wachovia that they were in a law suit with Proskauer Rose and an involuntary bankruptcy with Intel and former management. Ivewit retained legal counsel to investigate how these legal actions could be instigated without shareholder or management consent. It was later learned that stolen intellectual properties were being funneled into companies set up by former counsel whereby they were the shareholders of the similar and identically named companies to the Ivewit companies. A sophisticated shell game of corporations and intellectual properties in attempt to defraud the United States, the inventors and shareholders. In so designing this artifice to defraud, applications in false inventors names for the Ivewit inventions was then filed fraudulently in violation of federal code and finally further prosecuted in over thirty countries in violation of international treaties.
10 AICPA	Case No. TNS 2004-038 - Written Statement with evidence and witnesses that Gerald Lewin had violated ethical codes of conduct	Elizabeth Boltz, CPA originally started investigation. New investigator replaced her and dismissed the case due to too busy?	Deferred to Florida Department of Professional Regulation after two years whereby investigation was underway and then new investigator stated the department did not have the resources to investigate further.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The AICPA was apprised that crimes had been committed against the federal Small Business Administration and other United States departments and started an investigation. A new investigator took over the case and stated the AICPA was too busy to further investigate and to contact Florida State authorities? Despite overwhelming evidence that the accountant, Gerald Lewin and his daughter Erika were part of misleading Arthur Andersen auditors and were involved in crimes against the United States and were under investigation, the claim was that they had no resources to investigate
11 Boca Raton, Florida Police Complaint 1	Case No. 2001-054580 Embezzlement/Theft of Proprietary Equipment	J. Ulloa by William Kasser	6/20/2001 Brian G. Utley & Michael Reale found in possession of stolen proprietary equipment and forced to return stolen property by Boca PD.	Upon requests to re-open the case due to further evidence submissions entailing more criminal activities, including fraud on the United States, Detective Robert Flechaus stated he began new investigations with the SEC. The SEC denied ever being involved, information forwarded to FBI.
12 Boca Raton, Florida Police Complaint 1	Case # Stolen SBA and Corporate Funds over \$1,000,000 including SBA funds	Detective Robert Flechaus - Removed from case for internal affairs review	Ongoing	Case is under investigation and internal review by Chief Andrew Scott of the Boca Raton PD
13 Boca Raton, Florida Police Complaint 2	Case # - Stolen Patents and Crimes Against the USPTO & SBA	Detective Robert Flechaus - Removed from case for internal affairs review.	Ongoing	Case is under investigation and internal review by Chief Andrew Scott of the Boca Raton PD
14 Boca Raton Police Internal Affairs Investigation	Case #Unknown	Chief Andrew Scott	Ongoing	Case is under investigation and internal review by Chief Andrew Scott of the Boca Raton PD
15 New York Supreme Court Appellate Division First Department - Departmental Disciplinary	Petition for Investigation of Steven Krane, Kenneth Rubenstein and Raymond Joao for conflict of interest, appearance of impropriety and crimes against the United States	First Dept Justices: Angela M. Mazzarelli, Richard T. Andrias, David B. Saxe, David Friedman & Lewis A. Gonzalez	Order for Formal Investigation & Disposition of Conflicts and Appearance of Impropriety - Unpublished Orders M3198 - Krane / M2820 Rubenstein and M3212	Court order for investigation never completed. Waiting for new forum that is conflict free to file for enforcement of court order.

Ivewit Denial of Due Process Chart

<i>Department Filed With</i>	<i>Complaint</i>	<i>Filed With</i>	<i>Determination</i>	<i>NOTES</i>
16 New York Supreme Court Appellate Division First Department - Departmental Disciplinary	Complaint No. 2004.1883 Steven C. Krane, Esq. - Proskauer Rose LLP Intellectual Property Partner - Former President NYSBA & Member First Dept	Thomas Cahill, removed from case for conflict & appearance of impropriety, under special inquiry investigation	Supreme Court of New York - Appellate Division First Department - Justices Order Investigation for Conflicts and the Appearance of Impropriety. Unanimous Vote	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cases transferred for formal investigation, after review and deliberation of conflicts and appearance of impropriety by five justices of the New York First Department • Case originally dismissed upon review without investigation due to conflicts found in Steven Krane handling of complaints in violation of public office almost two years after it had begun. • Thomas Cahill, Chief Counsel, First Department now under special inquiry investigation for his part in aiding and abetting Krane, Rubenstein & Joao • Cahill upon request of Moatz of the USPTO-OED to contact him would not contact Moatz to enjoin investigations and prior to the federal OED investigation being completed tried to dismiss the cases without any formal investigation. At that time it was unknown that Krane was a leading disciplinary committee member with multiple roles at the First Dept. while handling complaints against his partners and then himself • Krane writes letter response to his complaint denying roles at the First Dept. Ivewit then contacted First Dept Clerk of the Court Catherine O'Hagan Wolfe to verify Krane's statement and she stated Krane was a member and that she personally sat on
17 New York Supreme Court Appellate Division Second Department - Departmental Disciplinary	Case No. T-1689-04 Steven C. Krane, Esq. - Proskauer Rose LLP Intellectual Property Partner - Former President NYSBA & Member First Dept	Dianne Kearse, Chief Counsel - CONFLICTS ADMITTED WITH ACCUSED STEVEN KRANE	Failed to complete First Dept. court ordered investigation. Waiting for conflict free forum to press for full investigation as ordered.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Further conflicts and violations of public offices were found and the Court Ordered Investigations by the First Department were never formally completed • Chief Counsel, Dianne Kearse, Second Dept DDC, writes Ivewit that cases were dismissed without investigation. No witnesses provided were called, no evidence tested and she claims she is not under the jurisdiction of the First Dept and therefore does not have to investigate under the court order • Kearse fails to respond to the First Dept with her decisions and instead attempts to dismiss the case through contacting Ivewit who did not order the investigation • Kearse admits conflicts with both Krane and Chief Judge of New York, Judith Kaye. • Kearse fails to disclose conflicts prior to handling the complaints • Kearse refuses to docket formally complaints against herself and Lawrence DiGiovanni, Chairman of the Second Dept DDC • Clerk of the Court, Pelzer (with no authority under the Disciplinary Dept., attempts to write letter stating that Kearse was wrong and that they did do an investigation but dismissed at the review stage • No witnesses provided were contacted, no evidence tested and Krane, Rubenstein and Joao, despite court orders for investig • Due to the fact that Krane and Chief Justice Judith Kaye are the two most influential members of the Courts and Disciplinary i • Krane is a Proskauer partner of the Intellectual Property group under investigation and Kaye was married to Stephen Kaye a f • After discovering that conflicts in New York were inherent at any disciplinary body in New York due to Krane and Kaye havin
18 New York Supreme Court Appellate Division First Department - Departmental Disciplinary. Thomas Cahill, removed from case for conflict & appearance of impropriety, under special inquiry investigation	Case No. 2003.0531 Kenneth Rubenstein & Proskauer Rose LLP		Supreme Court of New York - Appellate Division First Department - Justices Order Investigation for Conflicts and the Appearance of Impropriety. Unanimous Vote	See Notes for Krane First Dept investigation

Ivewit Denial of Due Process Chart

<i>Department Filed With</i>	<i>Complaint</i>	<i>Filed With</i>	<i>Determination</i>	<i>NOTES</i>
19 New York Supreme Court Appellate Division Second Department - Departmental Disciplinary	Case No. T-1688-04 - Kenneth Rubenstein & Proskauer Rose LLP	New York Supreme Court Appellate Division Second Department - Departmental Disciplinary.	Failed to complete First Dept. court ordered investigation. Waiting for conflict free forum to press for full investigation as ordered.	See Notes for Krane Second Dept investigation
20 New York Supreme Court Appellate Division Second Department - Departmental Disciplinary	Case No. Unknown Number - Raymond Joao, Proskauer & MLGWS	New York Supreme Court Appellate Division Second Department - Departmental Disciplinary.		Initially filed with Second Dept but case mysteriously transfers to First Dept with Rubenstein. Then the case is retransferred again to Second Dept with Rubenstein and Krane after discovery of conflicts and violations of New York Supreme Court - First Dept. - Disciplinary Dept.
21 New York Supreme Court Appellate Division First Department - Departmental Disciplinary. Thomas Cahill, removed from case for conflict & appearance of impropriety, under special inquiry investigation	Case No. 2003-0352 - Raymond Joao, Proskauer & MLGWS	New York Supreme Court Appellate Division First Department - Departmental Disciplinary. Thomas Cahill, removed from case for conflict & appearance of impropriety, under special inquiry investigation	Supreme Court of New York - Appellate Division First Department - Justices Order Investigation for Conflicts and the Appearance of Impropriety. Unanimous Vote	*Transferred back to Second Department for conflict and appearance of impropriety. See Krane First Dept notes
22 New York Supreme Court Appellate Division Second Department - Departmental Disciplinary	Case No. T-1690-04 - Raymond Joao, Proskauer & MLGWS	New York Supreme Court Appellate Division Second Department - Departmental Disciplinary.	Failed to complete First Dept. court ordered investigation. Waiting for conflict free forum to press for full investigation as ordered.	See Notes for Krane Second Dept investigation
23 New York Supreme Court Appellate Division First Department - Departmental Disciplinary. Thomas Cahill, removed from case for conflict & appearance of impropriety, under special inquiry investigation	Case No. 2004.1122 - Thomas Cahill, Chief Counsel First Dept.	Ongoing - Transferred to special investigator Martin Gold from First Dept. for conflict	Ongoing Formal Investigation	Ongoing. Cahill charged with aiding and abetting Krane, Rubenstein & Joao and attempting to cover up conflicts and violations of public office with Krane.
24 New York Supreme Court Appellate Division Second Department - Departmental Disciplinary	Complaint Refused Docketing - D. Kearse, Chief Counsel	New York Supreme Court Appellate Division Second Department - Departmental Disciplinary.	Waiting to have complaint filed and docketed according to law in a non-conflicted third party venue	*Kearse refused docketing a formal written complaint against herself filed with her at her request for failure to follow a court order and conflicts - Kearse handled this herself and with such complaint filed, continued to act without disclosure despite admitted conflicts and a complaint filed against her

Ivewit Denial of Due Process Chart

<i>Department Filed With</i>	<i>Complaint</i>	<i>Filed With</i>	<i>Determination</i>	<i>NOTES</i>
25 New York Supreme Court Appellate Division Second Department - Departmental Disciplinary	Complaint Refused Docketing - Chairman, Lawrence DiGiovanna	New York Supreme Court Appellate Division Second Department - Departmental Disciplinary.	Waiting to have complaint filed and docketed according to law in a non-conflicted third party venue	*Kearse refused docketing a formal written complaint against DiGiovanna sent to her at her request for failure to obey a court order
26 Florida Supreme Court	Case No. SC04-1078 Eliot Bernstein v. The Florida Bar - Petition to investigate Florida Bar complaints due to conflicts of interest and public office violations of Supreme Court Florida Bar Officers	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Justices o Wells o Anstead o Lewis o Quince o Bell o JJ 	Denied	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Florida Bar and Florida Supreme Court refuse formal and procedural docketing of complaints against officers with affirmed violations of public office, inapposite of the Florida and United States constitutions • Despite public office violations confirmed by The Florida Bar against officers, Florida Supreme Court refuses to prosecute and moves to destroy records opposite Florida record retention laws, attempts to destroy evidence of the conflicts and public office violations • Conflicts discovered elevate to Florida Bar President, Kelly Overstreet Johnson, found handling complaints against Christopher C. Wheeler (convicted of a Felony DUI with injury) while working as a lawyer under James Wheeler at a Florida law firm, without prior disclosure. • Florida Bar Counsel, John Anthony Boggs, attempts to dismiss attorney conflicts and violation of public offices by citing legislation he was proposing, instead of the law.
27 Florida Supreme Court - The Florida Bar	Case No. 2003-51 109 15© - Christopher C. Wheeler	Florida Supreme Court - The Florida Bar	Conflicts and Appearance of Impropriety Discovered. Case elevated to the Florida Supreme Court and then the United States Supreme Court - Wheeler gets arrested for felony DUI w/ Injury	Dismissed upon review without investigation and then re-opened and moved to the Florida Supreme Court upon discovery of conflicts of interest and appearance of impropriety in Matthew Triggs violation of public office in handling Wheeler complaint while in a blackout period precluding handling any matters for the Florida Bar. Without disclosure Triggs handled complaints for Proskauer partner Wheeler while in such blackout period.
28 Florida Supreme Court - The Florida Bar	Christopher C. Wheeler #2 - Complaint Refused Formal Docketing and Disposition, after conflicts and public office violations were discovered in Wheeler #1?	Florida Supreme Court - The Florida Bar		*Flabar and FSC refuse docket this formal written complaint where the charges were separate from Wheeler's first complaint and for additional conflicts, conflicts again confirmed by Flabar in writing
29 Florida Supreme Court - The Florida Bar	Complaint Refused Docketing by Bar despite confirmed conflicts - Matthew Triggs	Florida Supreme Court - The Florida Bar		*Flabar and FSC refuse docketing formal written complaint even though they confirm conflicts with Petitioner and violations of his public office position with Flabar. Elevated to the Florida Supreme Court which denied hearing the case. That decision elevated to United States Supreme Court which also denied hearing the case, leaving the Ivewit shareholders with no Court to hear complaints against public officers violating their public offices.

Iviewit Denial of Due Process Chart

<i>Department Filed With</i>	<i>Complaint</i>	<i>Filed With</i>	<i>Determination</i>	<i>NOTES</i>
30 Fifteenth Judicial District, Florida - Judge Jorge Labarga	Proskauer v. Iviewit Civil Case No. CA 01-04671 AB (At time of Iviewit discovering this law suit that management and shareholders were unaware of, it was not known that these were fraudulent companies set up by Proskauer to steal intellectual property.		Default Judgement against Iviewit for failure to retain replacement counsel	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dismissed upon review with no formal investigation • Labarga refuses to allow a counter complaint filed by competent counsel for Iviewit showing that attorneys in the billing case have committed crimes against the United States Patent & Trademark Office • Labarga dismisses Iviewit law firms after cancelling a trial date with no notice to Iviewit or either of two law firms handling the case for Iviewit. • Labarga immediately rules against Iviewit for failure to retain replacement counsel, after dismissing two law firms only days before. • Proskauer v. Iviewit will be appealed when due process and procedure can be insured based on new evidence. <p>o It was unknown at the initial lawsuit, that the companies involved in the lawsuit, although similarly named to Iviewit, were set up fraudulently by former counsel to harbor stolen intellectual properties that were almost identical to the Iviewit intellectual properties</p> <p>o It appears the combination of the bogus involuntary bankruptcy and the bogus lawsuit, were designed to take the stolen patents by instituting a lawsuit against these phony companies, whereby Proskauer would be the largest creditor in the bogus I</p>
31 Judicial Qualifications Commission	Case Docket No. 03352	Judicial Qualifications Commission and where the entire case will be appealed upon assurance of due process in a venue conflict free. Astounding new evidence shows the law suits were filed in fraud by Proskauer		
32 Florida Department of Business and Professional Regulation	Case Nos. 2004-053428 & 2004-053434 & 2004-053999	Angella Potter		Under review by Inspector General Office
33 Inspector General - Florida Department of Business and Professional Regulation		Inspector General - Carl Cook & Ron Russo		
34 Pennsylvania Bar	No docket # - Krishna Narine	Pennsylvania Bar	Dismissed without investigation	
35 Pennsylvania Bar	No docket # Andrew Barroway	Pennsylvania Bar	Dismissed without investigation	

Iviewit Denial of Due Process Chart

<i>Department Filed With</i>	<i>Complaint</i>	<i>Filed With</i>	<i>Determination</i>	<i>NOTES</i>
36 Virginia State Bar	Case Docket No. 04-888-1004 - William J. Dick & the law firm Foley & Lardner	Virginia Bar		Dismissed without investigation *Where Virginia Bar refuses to advance the complaints in accordance with well established rules or return phone calls regarding this matter. Even after being notified of the conflicts in Florida and New York and perjured statement made Dick to that tribunal and the United States Patent Office in his response. In the Iviewit rebuttal to the response, evidence of the perjures were presented. Also based on an intellectual property docket submitted by Dick on behalf of Foley & Lardner to that tribunal, upon review of the IP docket, Moatz of the USPTO-OED noted that certain information regarding the owners of those patents was false. This led to suspension of certain of the iviewit intellectual properties at the USPTO.
37 Institute of Professional Representatives Before the European Patent Office			Ongoing Formal Investigation	Complaints on file with the Institute of Professional Representatives Before the European Patent Office. Requests for investigation of Chris Mercer - President although investigation has been formally begun by that office
38 European Patent Office	Martyn Molyneaux & the law firm of		Ongoing	Complaints on file with the European Patent Office & Against Patent Attorney's Licensed with that Institution. Complaints on file against Molyneaux and all culpable law firms involved in filing the fraudulent applications in Europe. Requests for oversight at EPO.
39 Japanese Patent Office			Ongoing	Complaints on file against



Exhibit "D"



<u>Main Alleged Perpetrators¹</u>	<u>Name</u>	<u>Manager Contact Information</u>	<u>Acts Complaind</u>
Proskauer Rose, LLP 1585 Broadway New York, NY 10036-8299	Kenneth Rubenstein, Esq.	212.969.3030	Conspiracy; Sabotage of Patent prosecution; Breach of attorney/client privilege.
	Robert J. Kafin, Esq.	212.969.3030	Conspiracy.
	Allan S. Jaffe, Esq.	212.969.3030	Conspiracy.
	Christopher C. Wheeler, Esq.	212.969.3030	Conspiracy; Misappropriation and conversion of intellectual property.
	Steven C. Krane	212.969.3030	Conspiracy.
Meltzer Lippe Goldstein & Schlissel, LLP 190 Willis Avenue Mineola NY 11501	Lewis S. Meltzer, Esq.	516-747-0300 x144	Conspiracy.
	Raymond A. Joao, Esq.	516-747-0300 x144	Conspiracy; Sabotage of Patent prosecution; Breach of attorney/client privilege; Fraudulent document submissions to USPTO.
Foley Lardner LLP 777 East Wisconsin Avenue Milwaukee, WI 53202	William J. Dick, Esq.	414.297.5609	Conspiracy; Sabotage of Patent prosecution; Breach of attorney/client privilege; Fraudulent document submissions to USPTO.
	Douglas A. Boehm, Esq.	414.297.5609	Conspiracy; Sabotage of Patent prosecution; Breach of attorney/client privilege; Fraudulent document submissions to USPTO.
	Steven C. Becker, Esq.	414.297.5609	Conspiracy; Sabotage of Patent prosecution; Breach of attorney/client privilege; Fraudulent document submissions to USPTO.
Blakely Sokoloff Taylor & Zafman LLP 12400 Wilshire Blvd., 7 th Floor Los Angeles, Cal. 90025-1030	Norman Zafman, Esq.	(310) 207-3800	Conspiracy; Sabotage of Patent prosecution; Breach of attorney/client privilege; Fraudulent document submissions to USPTO.
	Thomas Coester, Esq.	(310) 207-3800	Conspiracy; Sabotage of Patent prosecution; Breach of attorney/client privilege; Fraudulent document submissions to USPTO.
	Farzad Amini, Esq.	(310) 207-3800	Conspiracy; Sabotage of Patent prosecution; Breach of attorney/client privilege; Fraudulent document submissions to USPTO.
Crossbow Ventures, Inc.	H. Hickman Powell III	(561) 838-9005	Conspiracy; Breach of Fiduciary duties as Director
	Rene Eichenberger	(561) 838-9005	Conspiracy
Past Iviewit Management	Brian G. Utley, Pres & COO	Forthcoming	Conspiracy; Grand Theft; Breach of fiduciary duties as Officer; Submission of fraudulent documents to USPTO
	Raymond Hirsch, VP	Forthcoming	Conspiracy; Grand Theft; Breach of fiduciary duties as Officer
	Michael A. Reale, VP	Forthcoming	Conspiracy; Grand Theft; Breach of fiduciary duties as Officer

¹ Not an exhaustive list.